

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1911 OF 2007

1.Mrs.Sugrabi Ramzan Khan,
2.Mrs.Kismat Unnisa Naim,
3.Mrs.Nusrat Sarvar Khan, &
4.Mrs.Ismat Shamim Ahmed. ...Applicants.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent.

....

Mr.Niranjan Mundargi, Adv. for the Applicants.

Mr.K.V.Saste,APP, for the State.

....

CORAM : SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI, J.

DATED : 21st June, 2007.

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Advocate for the Applicants and the learned APP for the State.

2. The applicants are seeking anticipatory bail in C.R.No.173 of 2007 of Trombay Police Station, Mumbai. The said case is under Sections 498-A, 342, 406 of IPC.

3. Applicant No.1 is the mother-in-law of the complainant and applicant Nos.2 to 4 are the sisters of the husband of the complainant. The

complainant who is about 23 years old was married to the son of applicant No.1 in the year 2004. It is her case that thereafter her husband and the present applicants started ill-treating her and harassing her on the ground that she should get Rs.5 lakhs. Applicant No.1 was residing in the same house as the complainant. Though, applicant Nos.2 to 4 were married, they used to visit the matrimonial house of complainant frequently. The husband of the complainant was at Dubai at the time of the incident. Sometime prior to the incident, the husband of complainant went to Dubai. At that time, he had said that she should get the money and if she did not get the money, she should not be seen in the house. Thereafter on 30.5.2007 the applicants reminded the complainant that her husband had told her that she should get the money, otherwise she should not be seen in the house. Applicant No.1 who is mother-in-law of the complainant told the complainant that if she was not going to get the money then she should commit suicide. At that time all the applicants abused complainant and forcibly got the complainant to write that she was committing suicide out of her own sweet will and

nobody was responsible for the same. Thereafter, applicant No.1 pulled the complainant out of the house and told her to go away. In that state of mind, the complainant reached Mankhurd railway station and stood in front of the train. Fortunately she did not lose her life, however, she lost her left leg in the incident.

4. The learned Advocate for the applicant has placed reliance on some conversations between the complainant and her father and other relatives in order to show the innocence of the applicants. However, at this stage no reliance can be placed on the said conversations. Some reliance could be placed on these conversations only after the evidence is led and the authenticity and genuineness of the said conversations is proved.

5. Looking to the facts as stated in the complaint, I do not think that this is a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the applicants.

6. Application is rejected.

. The applicants who are ladies are granted

..(4)..

time till 26th June, 2007 to surrender.

(SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI, J.)